MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE-S . A.

Mr. James declines answerir my questions on the ground that I expre med indifference to the issue of a discussion between him and another party. I did not express any indifference to the information which I sought from Aim. By this expert quibble be gracefully waves asize queries to which it is simply impore de for him to reply, without committing himself by inevitable sequence, to conclusions which he recurse either not to have the willingness or the courage seavow. It would be cruel to insist any further. So het Mr. James pass. Before doing so, however, since he charges "fallagies and misconceptions" upon my article, and refers me obliquely to his replies to The Observer, permit me to recapitulate the positions at which he has tarried temporarily while boxing the circle of possibilities in that discussion. I quote from

Position No. 1. "Marriage means nothing more and asshing less than the legal union of one man and one woman for life." It does not mean the voluntary union of the parties, or their mutual consent to live together durasts plactic, (during pleasure,) "but simply a legally reocially imposed obligation to live together durast plactic, (during pleasure,) "but simply a legally see (during live)." Mr. James's various articles on the subject.

That is to say, if I understand, that it is "the base legal bondage" or "outward force" which characterbee the union, and not the internal or spiritual union floving hearts which constitutes the marriage.

Position No. 2. "It is evident to every honest mind, that if our conjugal, parental, and social ties generally can be safely discharged of the parely disbolic ciement of outcord force, they must instantly become transfigured by their own inward, divine and irrestible loveliness." "No doubt, there is a very enormous clandestine vieletion of the marriage bond" [legal bond, of course, as he defined Marriage], "at the present time. The only possible chance for correcting it depends upon fully legitimating divorce; because, in that case, you place the inducement to matual sidelity no longer in the case legal bondage of the parties merely, but in their reciprocal inward sweetness or humanity." You must know many married partners who, if the marriage institution" [the legal bond] "were formally abolished to morrow would instantly small that keyal sobilion again by the unswerving constancy of their hearts and lives." That is, without marriage.

Position No. 3. "I have contended for treater freedom of divorce on these grounds;

To resume: These three positions are, if language

meens anything, as follows:

1. The whole and sole substance of Marriage is the

legal bond or outward force which unites the parties 2. This legal bond or outward force is a diabolical

element, and should be wholly abolished and dispensed 3. By dispensing with Marriage altogether-that is, with all outward form or legal bond, you do thereby strengthen the respect for Marriage, and purify and

senctify the institution !!! Position No. 4. Goes a step further, if possible, in absurdity, and proposes not merely to allow parties to unmarry themselves ad libitum, but to still further purify what remains of Marriage (after the whole of it is

abolished,) by turning disorderly members out, as they turn members out of church. See last article, passim. eltion No. 5. Intreats of the Editor of The Observer to let him off from the discussion-declines to answer my interrogatories—and, to make a verb of one of his pet substantives, he cuttle-fishes, by a final plunge

luto metobysical mysticism. When a writer, claiming distinction as a philosophical escayest, is content to rest his reputation upon a on of his avowed positions such as the above, culled from his own statements made during the course of a single discussion, he shall not be compelled by any "shade of impropriety" on my part, to undertake the distastsful task of discutangling himself from the

perplexing embraglia.

Dismissing Mr. James, permit me now to pay attention to your opinions. You, at least, I think, have the plack to stand by your own conclusions, unless you

are fairly driven off from them.

You affirm, with great truth, while you deplore it, that this is preeminently an age of "Individualism," wherein the "Sovereignty of the Individual,"—that is, "the right of every one to do pretty much as he pleases,"-is already generally popular and obviously gain-ing ground daily. Let us, then, define our positions. mistake in assigning you yours, you are quite competent to correct me. You declare yourself a reactionist against this obvious spirit of the age. You take your position in opposition to the drift,—I think you will find it the irresistible drift,—of that social revolution which you recognize as existing and progressing toward Individualism and the Sovereignty of the Individual. Freedom from State systems of Religion and Educa-tion, and Freedom of the Love Relations, to one and the same principle, and that principle you recognize, as the Spirit of the Age-the spirit of this, the most prosive and advanced age in the world's history. this element of progression you put yourself in a hostile attitude. You rightly say that all these varieties of Freedom "find their basis and element in that idea of 'Individual Sovereignty' which seems to us slike de structive of social and personal well-being.' I rejoice that you so clearly perceive the breadth and compa hensiveness of that principle, and that all the ruling questions of the day are merely branches of one and the same question, namely, whether the "Sovereignty of the Individual," or what is the same thing, the individual right of self-government be a true or a false, and consequently whether it be a safe or a dangerous prin This will greatly sarrow the limits of the discussion ; besides, it is much pleasanter to reason about general principles with one who is capable of grasping them, then to be carried over an ocean of particulars, apparently different, but really belonging to the same

This same principle of Individual Soverelenty, which to you seems destructive alike of social and persons well-being, is to me the profoundest, and mo ble, and most transcendently important principle of political and social order and individual well being ever discovered or dreamed of Now, them, we differ. Here, at the very start, is an illustration of Individuality, or diversity of opinion, and, growing out of that, of action also. We are both, I believe, equally honest lovers of the well-being of our fellow mean, but we homestly differ, from diversity of organization, intellectual development, past experiences. &c. Who, now, is the legitimate unpide between us! I affire, that there is none in the universe. I assert our cosenital poerage. I assert the deciring of non-intervention between individuals precisely as you do, and for the same reasons that you do between nations, so she principle of peace and harmony and good fellowship. Upon my principle, I atholt your complete sovereignty to think and act as you choose or must. I chain my own to do likewise. I chain and I admit the right to defer. This is simply the whole of it. No collision, no intervention can occur between political and social order and individual well being of it. No collision, no intervention can occur between, so long as both art on the principle, and only to m ur, so long as both art on the principle, and only to prevent intervention when either anempts to embare his principle? You determine, you being judge, that any opinions are immered, or that the action growing out of them would be injurious to other living individuals, or even to remote posterity. You, as their sold conjuntation guardian, summon to your aid the majority of the mob, who chance to think more nearly with you than with me for the nonce; you erect this unredecting mass of half-developed mind, and the power theore resulting, into an abstraction which you call "The State," and with that power at your back, you supprose, me by whatever means are requisite to the end—public offurn, the prison, the gibbet, the hemilock, or the cross. A subsequent are may recognize me as a Socrates or a Christ, sud, while they denounce your conduct with bitterness, never yet discover the falsing of the prisonple upon which you kanestly acted. They go on themselves to the end of the chapter, respecting the same united upon all the men of their day who offier, for good or far cell, from the opinions of mat same venerable took, called "The State."—Or, perchance, the mob, and consequently "The State."—

Or, perchance, the mob, and consequently "The State," may be on my dide—if not now, by and by—said then I or, perchance, the mob, and consequently "The State,"
may be on my side—if not now, by and by—and then i
suppress you. Which, now, of those two, is the princi-Or, premance, the more, and consequently 1 as Sam, may be on my dake—of not now, by and by—and then I suppress you. Which, now, of those two, is the principle off order in human affeirs? That I should judge for you and you for the, and each summon what power he may to enforce his ordinous on the other; or that each begin by admitting the Individual Sovereignty of the other—to be exercised by each at his own cost—within their time, about of sevend correctment.

other—to be exercised by adapt in its own cost—which indicates short of netual encrosciments.

With what force and beauty and truth does Mr. James seert that "Freedom, in any sphere, does not arrively beget disorder. He who is the ideal of Freedom is also the ideal of Order." He seems, indeed, wonderfully endewed by the half-light of intuition to discover the profoundest truths and to clothe them in delightful forms of extremely. It is tamentable to see how, when he are d expression. It is lamentable to see how, the his intellect to deduce their comelusions, ut into obscuriny and darkness. You see, on the con-rery, that this simple statement above ince. cut into obscurity and darkness. You see, on the contrary, that this simple statement alone, involves the whole decitine that I have ever essected of Individual Sastreinty. Hence the line of argument as between you and me is direct, while with him a loads nowhere. Your positions are intelligible; so I think are mine; Mr. J. are such as we find them. I am a Democrat, You, though not a Despotist conscientiously, and calling yourself a Progressive, are as yet merely a Republican; Re-

publicasism, when analyzed, coming back to the same thing as Despotism—the arbitrary right of the Mob, called the State, over my opinions and private conduct, instead of that of an individual despet. I am no sham Democrat. I believe in no Government of myorides. The right of self-government means with me the right of every individual to govern binaselt or it means nothing. Do not be surprised if I define terms differently from the common underwanding. I shall make myself

thing Do not be surprised if I define terms differently from the common understanding. I shall make myself understood nevertheless.

There are in this world two condicting principles of government. Stripped of all verblage and all illusion they are simply. Ist That Man is not capable of governing himself, and hence needs asses other man, (or men.) to govern him. 2. That man is capable of government, potentially, and that if he be not so actually, he needs more experience in the practice of it, including more evil consequences from feilure, that he must learn it for himself, as he learns other things; that he is entitled of right to his own self-government, whether good or toud in the judgment of others, whenever he exercises it shis own cost, that is without encroschment upon the equal right of others to govern themselves. This last is the doctrine of the Bovereignty of the Individual, which you densure and sposse, and which I defend it is simply the clear understanding, with its necessary extension and limitations, of the affirmation in the American Declaration of Independence, that "all men are entitled to Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness." The principle of Protestantism is the same in the religious sphere, "the right of private judgment in matters of faith and conscience." Either assertion includes virtually and by direct consequence the whole docrine of the Sovereignty of the Individual, or "the right of men to do pretty much as they please." The principle of the Individual, or "the right of men to do pretty much as they please." The right or wrong of this principle, dimly understood here tofore, has been the world's quarrel for some centures. Clearly and distinctly understood, with the full length of its reach before men seyes, it is to be the world aquarrel ever hereafter, until it is fairly and inhily socied. All men are now again rummoned to take sides in the fight, with the new light shed upon the length and breadth of the quarrel, by the development of modern losses, and especially by Socis

pretext of misunderstanding or incantious commital to the side of Freedom.

Still, you are not upon the opposite side in this contest. So far as any guiding principle is concerned, it seems to me that you, in common with the great mass of progressives, or half way reformers in the world, are simply without any—which you are willing to trust. The Concernatives are a great deal better off. So far as you slept a principle at all, it is generally that of this very individual Sovereignty, which nevertheless; you fear in its final carrying out; and hence you join the resisting carrying out; and hence you join the resisting temperature are the principle asserts a new one of its applications. The petty despot and the comfortable boargeois in Europe fear, from the same stand point, in the same manner, just as honestly, and with just as good reason, the Freedom of the Press.

A liberty which any body else in the universe has a right to define is no liberty for me. A pursuit of happiness which some despot, or some oligarchy, or some tyrannical majority has the power to shape and proscribe for me, is not the pursuit of my happiness. Statesmen, politicians, religious dissenters and reformers, who have not seen its full reach and expansion; hence they become Reactionists, Conservatives, and "Old Fogles" when the whole truth is revealed to them. They find themselves getting more than they bargained for. Nevertheles, the principle, which slready imbues the

when the whole truth is revealed to them. They find themselves getting more than they bargained for. Nevertheles, the principle, which already imbues the popular mind instinctively, though not as yet intellectually, will not writ their leave for its development, nor stop at their binding. Hence all middle men, far more than the concervatives, are destined in this age to be exceedingly unhappy. A mere handful of individuals, along with myself, do now, for the first time in the world, secept and announce, the sovereignty of the individual, with ell its consequences, as the principle of Order as well as of Liberty and Happiness among men, and challenge its acceptance by mankind. The whole world is driting to our position under the influence of forces too powerful to be resisted, and we have had merely the good or ill fortune to arrive intellectually at the common lenge its acceptance by mankind. The whole world is dritting to our position under the influence of forces too powerful to be resisted, and we have had morely the good or ill fortune to arrive intellectually at the common goal in advance of the multitude. It gives us we least this happiness, that we look with plequare and a sense of entire security upon the on-coming of a revolution, which to others is an object of terror and dismay. In our view, the ultra political Democrat of our day, has only half taken his lessons in the rightful expansion of human freedom. He, too, is, resistively to us, an "Old Fogey." Nor do we trust the safety of the final absence of Legislation to any vague notions of the natural goodness of man. We are fully aware that no sum total of good Intentions, allowing them to exist, amounts to a guarantee of right action. We trust only to the rigid principles of a science, which analyzes the causes of crimand neutralizes the motives which now induce or provoke mento commit it. You speak in the most hopeless manner of the final removal of murder from the face of the earth. Do you reflect that already among us, one half the crimes of the Old World or of other countries are entirely unknown as crimes. Such are lize angiest and heresy, the attendace of treason, &c., &c. Thirty hours ride couth of us the crime which actually shocks the public mind more than any other is Negro-Stealing. Throughout the Southern States it is pretty mach the only crime that is rigorously punished. Here it is unknown, even by name, among the common people. What, now, is the cause of this wonderful phenomenon—that one-half of the known crimes of the world are actually gone out and extinguished in this the freest and rebellious humanity have themselves gone out—not, as is thoughtlessly supposed, to be replaced by better institutions, but by the absence of institutions against which those crimes are but the natural protest of oppressed and rebellious humanity have themselves gone out—not, as is thoughtlessly supposed, bec principle of "Commercial Equity" which, thanks to the same Science of Society, is now known in the world, Wemanshall be placed upon a footing of entire pecuniary independence of man and installed in the actual possister, as well as admitted to the right, of being 4a Individual. There is already far less marder among us than elsewhere in the world, because there are less institutions to be offended against. With still less institutions there will be still less murder, and with the addition of equitable relations because there and less institutions of equitable relations. The way to produce it and the way to provent it is a matter of Science, just as much as any chemical process. Chemical processes go on and fail to go on its nature without our knowledge, but we can learn them and heaten or prevent them. Crime springs solely from two causes. I. The existence of arbitrary institutions, and the ignorant and false kleas in men's minds growing out of or relating to those institutions, whereby acts are construed to be crimes which by the institutes of natural law are no crimes; and 2. The denist of Equity, growing out of imporance of the The details of Equity, growing out of innorance of the scientific principle effective, and out of the want of suf-ncient intelligence and expansion of the intellect to cas-ble men to see that their interests lie in adopting and the men to see that men interests he in assigning as-neting upon that principle, when known In other words out of the doubled the Sovereignty of the Individual in all things, and cut of a false or unscientific commercia

I see clearly and even sympathise with, while I do not partake of, the fears of the conservative and halfnot partake of the fears of the conservative and half-way progressive, from the growth of the Sovereignty of the helividual. Stall further, I recognize that evils and discretely conduct grow out of its growth, when unst-tended, as a is biftherto by "Eaginy" in the distribution of the burdens and benefits of him. But I see just as clearly that the remedy for those evils does not lie in the direction of repression or foreible positions. the acceptance and solution of an entirely new princi-ple of order—not in going backward to a system which has been track and dissertently failed, for thousands of years, but in going forward to the discovery and appli-cation of a new and officecious system.

You expressly acknowledge—you cannot but sek-move dgo, that harrings does not work well for all the parties concerned—only for some of them; and the first must be content to sacrifice their life long happi-ness and well being for the good of the others. No such system will ever content the world, nor ever should, it does not meet the wants of man. Your line of reason-ing is after the old sort, that the Sixte exists not for the act of this or, the individual but for the good of alleing is after the old sort, that the Scate exists not for the good of this or that individual, but for the good of all-when you begin by soluting that the good of all is not secured. You are, of course, aware that this is the argument of every despot and despotion in the world, under which the liberties of all manking that we always been stolen. The argument is the same, and just as good in the mouth of Louis Napoleon as it is in yours. It is just as good as a reason for depriving me of the Freedom of the Press, as it is when urged as a rosson for depriving me of freedom in the most sacred affections of the beart. The most suppundous miscake that this world of ours has ever made is that of erecting an abstraction, the State, the Chorel, Public Morelity, recording to some accepted standard, or some other ideal thing, into a real personality, and making it personant to the will and happiness of an Individual.

So much for principles. Now, then, there is an-

So much for principles. Now, then, there is an other thing in the world which is called expediency which is just as right and just as good a thing in his place as principle. Principle indicates the true and right toward which we are to sim, and which we are itselfy to attain—Expediency, what we are to do provisionly, or as the next best thing, in the midst of the wrong by which we are surrounded, while working to vindicate Principle, or to secure the final right. If your Tariff doctrinor, for example, and other repressive to visidaste Principle, or to secure the faul right. If your Tariff doctrines, for example, and other repressive measures were put fairly on the basis of expediency, or present existency, and admitted to be wrong in principle, evia thouselves, to be realously overflower as soon as practicable, I might go a great way along with you. Extremelancet. Firm and intelligent R sinchligm has many points of relationship to right Conservation. Its surface action is often just the reverse of its deeper and more persistent movement. You certainly do not mean to assert that Free Trade is a wrong thing in itself, that it is a breach of one of Nature's laws, a thing to be

feared and defended against, if the whole world were dealing fairly and honestly in the reward of Labor, and in their interchanges with each other. You mean that, because the European capitalist deals with his laborer upon such terms as render him a pouper, American is, herers are compelled by their wrone, to report to another dealing fairly and honestly in the reward of Labor, and in their interchanges with each other. You mean that, because the European capitalist deals with his laborer are compelled, by their wrong, to resort to another wrong, and refuse to buy these starvation products, is order to protect their own labor from the same depression through the wrong of others to deprive themselves of one right, as an expediency, to secure themselves in the possession of another right. Home you are found defending a teriff on the ground that it is the most speedy arenue to Free Trade with safety—Free Trade and asfety being both goods to be sought after and attained. So, again, you do not and cannot mean that the time is never to come when woman shall possess the freedom to bestow herself according to the dictates of her own affections, wholly apart from the mercanary considerations of shelter, and food and rainent, and evolepment and varied experience of the afactions is intrinsically a bad thing, any more than the development of the bodily strength or of the intrillect particularly that it is bad relatively to the present depressed and dependent condition of the woman; just as intellectual development is a unifortune to he share, only tending to render him unhappy until the fical period appreaches for his emancipation. You certainly do not believe that human society in the highest axes of well-being it is destined to attain, is ever to be attended by an army of marryre who most sacrifice their own highest happiness of all the parties immediately concerned to the security and well-being of somebody clase remotely interested. Do you or do you not, then, alvocate restrictions upon the exercise of the affections, as you do he Tarifi, merely as a means of arriving the more speedly at complete "free Trade"? Dismis, I entrent you, all your fears of the Sovereignty of the Individual. Cherish it rather as the glorious realization of the golden ago of the future. Instead of whitewashing repression and reaction and martyrdom, and breling them

whether men of women. It is not soon to an income tion, and the most sublime and the most beautiful hope of the world.

You refer to my position on the Marriage question as well understood. Unfortunately, it is not so, and cannot be so, if that question is considered by itself. I have no special doctrine on the subject of Marriage. I regard Marriage as being neither better nor worse than all other of the arbitrary and artificial institutions of Society—contrivances to regulate nature instead of studying her laws. I ask for the complete emancipation and self-ownership of Woman's Rights women simply nean this, or do not yet know what they mean. So of Mr. James. So of all reformers, The Observer is logical, shrewd and correct, when it affirms that the whole body of reformers tend the same way, and bring up somer or later against the legal or prevalent theological idea of Marriage. It is not, however, from any special hostility to that institution, but from a growing consciousness of an underlying principle, the inspiring soul of the activities of the present age—the Sovereignty of the Individual. The lesson has to be learned that nearly is to be the work of Science, and not of arbitrary legislation and criminal codes. Let the day come! meny, is to be the work of Science, and ultimeting in Har-meny, is to be the work of Science, and not of arbitrary legislation and criminal codes. Let the day come! STEPHEN PLAN. ANDREWS.

Reply to the Foregoing. Mr. S. P. ANDREWS: Let me begin by setting you right respecting my position, on point where you expressly invite if not challenge correction. I never indicated "freedom from State systems of Religion" as one of the impulses of our time against which I take my stand. I think you never understood me to do so. Nor do I regard the strong tendency of our time to wild, ultra Individualism as an element of any Progress, but that made by Eve at the serpent's suggestion, Sodom just pravious to Lot's escape from it, Rome just before its liberties were destroyed by Cæsar, and others in like circumstances. Admit the legitimacy of Egotism, or the selfish pursuit of happiness by each Individual, and a government of despotism seems to me a logical and practical necessity. Had the Pilgrim Fathers of American Liberty cherished your ideas of the sovereignty of the Individual, I have no shadow of doubt that their children would, long ere this, have passed under the yoke of a despotism as rigorous as that of Nicholas or Louis Napoleon. They founded Liberty, because they taught and practiced Self-Denialthe subordination of the Individual will and pleasure to the Will of God, (or, if you please, the Common Weal)-and thus only, in my judgment, can Liberty ever be founded and per-

petuated. You totally mistake in attributing to me the assertion of the principle of Non-Intervention between Nations, as the principle of Peace and Harmony. On the contrary, I deplore the absence of competent tribunals to adjudicate questions of International difference, and believe all peaceful, just Nations should prompt ly combine to establish such tribunals. Had such existed in 1846, we must have been spared the waste and the butchery, the guilt and the shame, of our bloody forny on Mexico. How readily all the intrigues and agitations of our day respecting Cuba would be settled by a just International Supreme Court! So far from releicing or acquiescing in its absence. I deplore that circumstance as the great scandal and calamity of Christendom.

The State is to me something other and more than a mob, because I believe that, since Justice is all men's true and permanent intercet, the heat of passion or the lust of gain, which too often blind men to the iniquity of their own personal acts, are far less potent in their influence on those same men's judgment of the acts of others. I believe, for instance, there are two men in the State of New-York who are personally licentious for every one who would gladly see Libertinism shielded and favored by law. Men who roll vice as a sweet morsel under their tongues are yet desirous that Virtue shall be generally prevalent, and that their own children shall be trained to love and practice it. I do, therefore, appeal to the State,' or the deliberate judgment of the community, to arbitrate between us, believing that the State properly exists as a "terror to evil-doers and a praise to them that do well," and that it not only does but should judge and deal with effenders against Sexual Purity and the Public Well-being. I think it ought to "suppress," not the expression of your opinions, but such action as they tend to clothe with impunity; and, so far from deprecating their contingent suppression of me, should ever your principles gain the ascendency. I prefer to be suppressed, for I would not choose

As to the harmonizing of Freedom with Order, I too desire and anticipate it; but not through the removal of all restraints on vicious Appetite. On the contrary, I expect and shor | follows:

for its realization through the diffusion of Light and Truth with regard to our own natures, organizations, purposes, and that Divine Law which overrules and irradiates them all, In other words, I look for the harmonizing of Desire with Duty, not through the blotting out of the latter, but through the chastening, reaevating and purifying of the fermer. As to the right of Self-Government, there is

no such radical difference between us as you assert. You, as well as I, find a large class of men who are nor capable of Self Government; for you acquiesce in the imposition of restraint upon the lunatic, thief, burglar, counterfeiter. forger, maimer and murderer. Where is their " inalienable right to Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness !"- 'Ah! you say, 'these men are depredators on the equal rights of others.'- Very well,' I reply, 'so are the Seducer, Adulterer, Gambler, and dispenser of Alcoholic Beverages. Who would not rather have his property wrested from him by robbery than his children entired into dens of infamy and there debauched and corrupted! Where is the man who does not feel and know that the seducer of his innocent daughter-(perhaps a mere child of fifteen)-is a blacker villain, and more deserving of punishment (no matter for what end you apply it) than any street rowdy or thief! When you invoke 'the Sovereigne of the Individual' to shield that villain from the Law's terrors, you do what no uncorrupted conscience can calmly justify. As you seem unable to discern the principles

which underlie my position on this subject, let me briefly state them: 1. Man has no moral right to do wrong. 2. The State ought to forbid and repress all acts which tend, in their natural consequences, or through the principles they involve, to corrupt the morals of the community, and so increase the sum of human degradation and wretchedness. 3 It is wiser, humaner, every way preferable, that crimes should be precented than that they should be punished. 4. The great mass of criminals and public pests among us began their downward courses by Gambling, Tippling, or Lewdness; and these are almost uniformly the initial steps to a career of outlawry, depravity and flagrant crime. 5. Sexual Love was implanted in man by his Creator expressly that the Race should be perpetuated,-not merely brought into existence, but properly nurtured, protected, guided and educated. All Sexual Relations that do not contemplate and conform to these ends are sinful and at war with the highest good of Humanity. 6. The commandment from Sinai, 'Thou shalt not commit Adultery,' is a part of the natural or moral law, contemplating and forbidding every form of Sexual Relation except the union for life of one man with one woman in obedience to the Divine end above indicated. 7. Hence (not because of the law given by Moses, but in accordance with the same perception of moral fitness or necessity) the State honors and blesses Marriage, (which is such union, and none other) and frowns upon all other sexual rela-

It is nonsense, Mr. Andrews, to talk of your notion of Individual Sovereignty as a new discovery, and of our antagonist views as mossgrown. From the remotest heathen antiquity, nearly every savage or barbarous people has acted far nearer to your principles than to ours. Polygamy, Divorce at pleasure, and still wider Licentiousness, are all nearly as old as sin, and have very generally gone unwhipt of human justice. It is our doctrine that crime should be dealt with in the egg, and not suffer the vulture to attain his full growththat it is better to Prevent than Punish-that is relatively novel, with its Maine Laws, anti-Gambling laws, penalties for Seduction, &c. The tendency, so obvious in our day, to revolt against all legal impediments to the amplest sensual indulgence, is a reaction against this, which is destined to give us trouble for a time, but I have no fear that it will ultimately prevail.

You deem me hopeless of the eradication of murder, and argue that, as we in New-York have now no such offenses as less majesté, heresy, speken treason, negro-stealing, &c., so we may (thus runs your logic) get rid of murder in like manner by no longer visiting it with a penalty or regarding it as a crime. I am not sure of the efficacy of this remedy. I have read with some care De Quincev's ' Papers on Murder considered as one of the Fine Arts,' and while I have certainly been enlightened by them as to the more poetical aspects of human butchery, I do not feel that my personal objections to being knocked down with a slung-sire or paving-stone, dragged up some blind aller and there finished, have been materially softened by his magnificent rhetoric. I still think murderers unsafe persons to go at large-and so of seducers and adulterers. I think they would do the commonwealth more good and less harm engaged at Sing-Sing than abroad in

You tell me, indeed, that "there will be no Seduction, no Bigamy, and no Adultery when there is no legal and forceful institution of Marriage to defend." I think I understand you. You mean that, if the legal inhibitions and penalties now leveled at the acts thus designated be abolished, they will no longer be found in the catalogue of offenses; but you do not mean, as your whole essay clearly shows. that no such acts as are new known by those names will be committed. On the contrary, you glory in the belief that they will be far more abundant than they now are. In other words, you believe that the acts known to our law as Seduction, Bigamy and Adultery ought to be committed and ought not to to be repressed-that they outrage no law of nature or morality, but only certain arbitrary and ignorant human interdicts.

I hold exactly the contrary-that these are acts which God and all good men must reprobate, though the law of the land had never named them. I hold the systematic Seducer to be the vilest wolf ever let loose to prey on innocence and purity, and one who offends far more flagrantly against the natural or divine Law than any thief or burglar. So of the Bigamist, whose crime is generally perpetrated through the most atrocious deceit and periody. So of the Adulterer .- I take up a paper now before me, and read in a Philadelphia letter as

"Celostis Wilson, a Poissh Catholic Priest, cloped from this city some days since with a married woman. It is telleved they have gone West. "Henry Schriver cloped from this city last week with the wife of a neighbor, leaving behind a wife and several

Here are four persons, all of whom have deliberately broken the most solemn vows Heaven was ever invoked to witness,-three of whom have deceived and betrayed those to whom they had sworn fidelity in the most important and intimate relation of life-one, at least, of whom has deserted the children he was bound by every tie of Nature and Duty to support and educate in the ways of wisdom and virtue-yet all throwing themselves on their Individual Sovereignty and trampling on every dictate of Duty in subserviency to their own selfish lusts,-and what would your doctrine do with them ! Nothing, but save them the expense of running away. They might have taken respectively the next house to that they deserted, and there flaunted their infidelity and lechery in the eyes of the partners they had perfidiously deserted, the children they had abandoned. I cannot think this an improvement. On the contrary, so long as men and women will be thus unprincipled and lecherous, I am glad that the Law imposes on them at least the tribute to public decency of running away. And this reminds me of the kindred case of

two persons in Nantucket who have advertised in the newspapers that they have formed a matrimonial connection for life, or as long as they can agree; adding that they consider this partnership exclusively their own affair, in which nobody else has any concern. I am glad they have the grace not to make the State a party to any such arrangement as this. But true Marriage-the union of one man with one woman for life, in hely obedience to the law and purpose of God and for the rearing up of pure, virthous and modest sons and daughters to the State-is a union so radically different from this. that I trust the Nantucket couple will not claim or that at all events their neighbors will not concede, to their selfish shameful, alliance the honorable appellation of Marriage. Let us at least 'hold fast the form of sound words.' I do not care to follow you over a wide area

which has no necessary connection with our theme. Suffice it that I regard Free Trade as neither right nor wrong, good nor bad, in itself, but only in view of its practical issues. It is always bad when it tends to throw workers out of employment or diminish the scanty rewards of Labor. When the Social and Industrial condition of the various Peoples shall have been so equalized that there will be no temptation to undersell and supplant the Industry of one Nation with the cheaper products of an other, then absolute Free Trade may work well; but the mere equalization of wages is but one among several conditions precedent to healthful freedom from imposts. The Cotton Manufactures of India were ruined and the Manufacturers starved by the far better paid labor of England, aided by vastly superior machinery. A wise, paternal Indian Governmen would have prohibited the British Cottons until the British machinery could have been somehow secured and set sufficiently to work. Thus efficient Protection would have opened the speediest way to beneficent Free Trade; and so in other cases. But understand me to believe and hold that what you commend as "the free play and full development and varied experience of the affections"!! is not and never can be a good thing, but will remain to the end of the world a most revolting and diabolic perversion of powers divinely given us for beneficent and lofty ends to the base uses of selfish and sensual appetite-to uses whereof the consistent development and logical expression are exhibited in the Harlot and the

It is very clear, then, Mr. Andrews, that your path and mine will never meet. Your Socialsm seems to be synonymous with Egotism : mine, on the contrary, contemplates and requires the subjection of individual desire and ratification to the highest good of the community-of the personal to the universal-the emporary to the everlasting. I utterly abhor that you term 'the right of woman to choose the father of her own child'-meaning her right to choose a dozen fathers for so many different children-seeing that it conflicts directly and fatally with the the paramount right of each child through minority to protection, quardianship and intimate daily counsel and training from both parents. Your Sovereignty of the Individual is in paleable collision with the purity of Society and the Sovereignty of God. It renders the Family a smoke-wreath which the next puff of air may dissipate-a series of 'dissolving views,' wherein 'Honor by father' would be a command impossible to bey-gor, indeed, can I perceive how the father, under your system, would deserve honor at the hands of his child. In such a bestial Pandemonium as that system would inevitably create I could not choose to live. So long as those who think as I do are the majority in this country, the practitioners on your principles will be dealt with by law like other malefactors; and if ever your disciples shall gain the ascendancy we will go hence to some land where mothers are not necessarily wantons, love is not lust, and the selfish pursuit of sensual gratification is not dignified with the [Ed. honors due to wisdom and virtue.

Our City Affairs in the State Segate. In the State Senate, on Wednesday, Mr. Tar moved to go into immediate committee on the Broadway Railroad.

Mr. Cornell moved to lay the motion on the table. The Senate refused, and adopted Mr. Taber's motion And then the Broadway Railroad bill was taken up; Mr. Williams in the chair.

Mr. Conger being entitled to the floor, resumed his Ar. Conger being critical to the floor, resumed his speech in opposition to the bill. He said he was not advocating the right of the association to go on with the read, but he did believe the right of petition was involved in a clear and talk consideration of all the elementance. The quastion involves the right of the people, as inhabitants of New-York. The streets there are listed in fee, by the Mayor, Aldermen and Community of New-York, and under the latter title, all those who traverse the streets have a right of property in those, in a much higher degree than the owners of property. The high was further account by the

rerise the streets have a right of property in them, in a much higher degree than the owners of property.

The bill was further opposed by Mr. Conger, taking ground in behalf of the inhabitants of New York against the owners of Brossdawy property.

Mr. Mr. Murray offered an amendment, that "the Corporation of New-York shall not construct or authorize the construction of any Bullway through or spon the whole or any portion of any public streetor are not of said Cay, nor shall now much. Bullway to experience he in the property of the prop

nor rimit any such Rullway be constructed by the ag-thority derived or to be derived from them, until a pre-views act of the Legislature shall be passed, prescribing terms and conditions under the City Charter and law of the strice upon which City Rullways may be con-

Mr. Fabcock replied to Mr. Conger.

Mr. Taber urged the adoption of some measure to skep the robbery. The great mass of the residents of New-York, interested in the welfare of the City, would hold up both hands to have the transaction stopped.

Mr. Bristol suggested that, as the Common Council of New-York were charged with so many encenties, the consent of the Legislature be required to all their sets. He moved an amendment accordingly. Lost.

Mr. Bartlett was not prepared to vote for the bill. He had reported it as the Chairman of the Railway Qounmitee, and he stated his reasons for so doing. He thought it strange there was no petition for the bill.—There was nothing from New-York but a measurial from friends of the bill, asking for an investigation into the charges made against them. He was in favor of having these charges investigated, and hoped the Senate would order it.

Mr. Cooley would go into an investigation after the

bill passed,
Mr. Seekman coincided in this view.
Mr. McMurray's amendment and the bill was gone through with.

Mr. Cornell thought the action of the Senate was too hasty. He would report progress. Lost.

Mr. Conger moved to strike out the enacting clause.

Lost.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third read-

THE MAGAZINES.

"BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE" for Jan. opens with an elaborate article on "Slavery in the United States," giving a variety of important statistics on the subject, showing the actual and contingent retribution to which the first legislation on slavery has led, and arguing that the question is by no means settled either in its relations to internal policy or in bearing on foreign nations. The writer in Blackwood has been led into a grave error of fact and reasoning by a palpable blunder in the American Almanoc, which been repeated for two years in that pub Alluding to the wretched condition of the whites who do not own slaves in the slave-holding States, he remarks that "it explains, what at first sight is very inexplicable on this side of the Atlantic, that the whole free population of the slave States is actually de creasing instead of increasing, as we are in the habit of believing to be the case all over the Union. Thus, in the two censuses of 1840 and 1850, the total free population in the free and slave States respectively was

Free States. 9.03,835 13,81,385
Siave States. 7,29,719 6,381,285
So that, while in the last ten years the population of our million the free States has increased by nearly for that of the slave States, though Texas has been added to them in the interval, has diminished by nine hundred

These figures are correctly copied from the American dimenae, which the writer quotes as his authority for the statement; but on refering to the tables of the Almanee it will be seen that the number of the total pepulation, free and slave, in 1840, is given for that of the free population in the same year; so that deducting from 7,290,719 the total population of the slave States in 1840, the number of slaves 2,481,532, we have 4,809,187 as the true figures for the free population in that year The total free population in 1850 was 6,412,151, which shows an actual gain of 1,602,964. Thus much of the writer's argument therefore is mere waste paper, for which he must thank the confused statistics of the American Almanac -A new story entitled "Lady Lee's Widowhood"

commences in this number, and Thomas Moore forms the subject of an agreeable article. (L. Scott & Co.)

"GRAHAM'S MAGAZINE" for February howe no striking difference from the previous issues. The contents, which include both original and selected matter, present a great variety, adapted to almost every taste. Many of the reeders, no doubt, will find comfort in an abusive and vulgar article on "Uncle Tom's Cabin," but more will be disgusted with its coarse tlip pancy. The admission of such effusions of sectional spleen is suicidal in a magazine intended for general circulation. Among the contributors are Herbert. De ganne, Whipple, and other favorite writers. (Dewitt &

IF "Godey's Lady's Book" for February. This number has a clever sketch of New-England life, entitled "Old Times in the Granite State, Editress, Mrs. Sarah J. Hale, whose "refined intell and pure heart " are alluded to with delightful complacency in another portion of the number. A brief as tice of Mrs. Crosland, a popular English writer, by Mrs. Mowait, is very much to the purpose. The em bellishments are not remarkable either for their sub jects or their execution. (H. Long & Brother.)

CITY ITEMS.

Gottschalk, the celebrated pianist, will give his first Concert at Niblo's saloon, on Friday even-

ENTERTAINMENTS .- Dr. REDFIELD will give a fecture upon Physiognomy, with practical illustrations, this evening at No. 413 Broadway.

at the BROADWAY THEATER in Bellini's great opera of 'Norma," in which she made such a sensatio night. We understand that nearly all the seats in the house were taken yesterday. Madame Alboni will immediately leave for Bostor, where she is to appear

At WALLACE's to night, "The Handsome Husband," nd Colman's capital comedy of "The Heir-at-Law, by Laura Keene, Brougham, Blake, Hale, &c. At Buaron's, Colman's Comedy of "The Heir at

at NIRLO's, with the full strength of the company,

Madame Sontag will give "La Sonnambula" to night

Law," by Mrs. Skerrett, Burton, Johnston, Thompson, &c. To conclude with the "1,000 Milliners." At the Museum, Gen. Tom Thumb will hold his reglar levees, in connection with various other amuse

At the Cracus, the comic piece of "Harlequin and the Ghost," with other equestrian feats in great va-

At Wood's, there will be the usual variety of Ethi-

opian melodies, dances, recitations &c.

At Helles's, the extraordinary wonders of necro-mancy, elight of hand, the inexplicable secondsight, &c., &c. At BANVARD's, will be exhibited the highly interest ing Panorama of the Holy Land, with the most remark-

able places mentioned in the Scriptures.

At Riskey's, the Panorams of the River Thames is still on exhibition, giving faithful views of remarkable scenes in England.

At the Studio Curroso may be seen a rare collection of remarkable curiosities.

The weather was without change up to I o'clock this morning, but the mercury was slowly rising, and the sir portended a return to a milder and worse condition.

The "Norma," of Madam Alboni, last night, drew a house so full that comfort and even hoaring was out of the question, except to those fortunates who were early located in secured seats. From the appliance bestowed by those who could hear, we should judge that Medem A. was, as heretofore, erginently

HANDROOKS OF THE OPERA.-Decidedly the

hest librettes which have come to our notice are those published by Davidson, No. 109 Nassauet. They are correct versions of Italian and French originals, with faishful English translations, and the most popular solos and chorness of each Opera, in Music, so that the hear er can follow not only the words but the notes of the more important parts. In Norms, for instance, we have sic of the chorus "Dell' sura tus profet ica," the solo "Me protegge!" the chorns "Norms viene!" the solo "Casta Diva," the solo "Ah! bello " mer ritorns," the duet "Vient in Roma," the dust "Ak si, fa core," the solo "Deh! con te, con te li prendi," the duct "Si fino all" ore e streme," the duct "Mira,o Norma," and the duct "Qual cor tradict," making cleven of the gems of this Opera. The other Opera are similarly illustrated. Mr. D. has already published Norma, Semirande, Medea, Don Giovenni, L'Ellar d'Amore ji le lio, Roberto il Diavale, Remeo and Jalie. Gustave III., Lucis di Lammermoor, Otolio, Don Fescuale, Ernani, La Cenerenzola, Masaniello, Le Propote, Lindi di Chamcunix, Il Prodigo, Der Frieschatz, Fre Diavelo, The Huguenets, and the Orstories of Tist iah, Israel in Egypt, and Samson Creation, The Ma These books will be of great advantage to Operagoers and amoteurs in the music of the great com-